

Remarks/Arguments:

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action indicates that the method step limitations recited in the claims must be shown as in an appropriate flowchart or the features canceled from the claim. It is further stated that it is "recommended that the applicant include a drawing(s) showing the circuitry/hardware that this method is implemented on."

Applicants respectfully submit that such drawings are not necessary. With respect to the proposed flowchart, M.P.E.P. states in §601.01(f) that "[i]t has been USPTO practice to treat an application that contains at least one process or method claim as an application for which a drawing is not necessary for an understanding of the invention under 35 U.S.C. 113 (first sentence)." It is clear that the USPTO recognizes that a drawing is not necessary for a method when such is claimed.

With respect to the recommendation to include a drawing showing the circuitry/hardware that the method is implemented on, applicants again submit that such a drawing is not necessary. The statute provides at 35 U.S.C. §113 that "[t]he applicant shall furnish a drawing where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented." Applicants respectfully submit that the recommended drawing is not necessary for an understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented.

It is respectfully requested that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 13-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,645,352 (Menten) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,322,166 (Furuya et al.). Applicants traverse these rejections.

Independent claim 13 recites a "[m]ethod for generating a corrected nominal current in a pulse-width-modulated current control, in particular for electronic brake control units of motor vehicles, wherein a measured current is determined at a certain predetermined time during an actuation period and a compensation is executed by way of compensation variables in response to temperature and supply voltage, which are added to the measured current so that the corrected nominal current is available for current control, and wherein the compensation variables are stored in a table and an interpolation is carried out for temperatures lying

between two table values and supply voltages lying between two table values in order to determine the compensation variable."

The Office Action does not cite Menten for any teaching or suggestion of stored correction variables and relies on Furuya et al. for teachings of such. The Office Action cites to Furuya et al. Fig. 17 and column 18, lines 21-28, and column 17, lines 3-6, for teaching interpolation with regards to temperature and supply voltage, respectively. Applicants respectfully submit that Furuya et al. fails to teach such.

Furuya et al. specifically explains at column 18, lines 6-21:

At a subsequent step 162, the coil temperature is obtained. It is noted that the coil temperature is a temperature of the coil 305 of the solenoid valve 300, which is obtained as follows. First, a temperature coefficient is obtained from a characteristic view of regenerative current vs. temperature coefficient as shown in FIG. 17 and based on a measurement value at the point A and the duty ratio. It is noted that in this characteristic view, the duty ratio is divided into three, i.e. large, medium and small magnitudes.

Next, the coil temperature is obtained from a characteristic view of temperature coefficient vs. coil temperature as shown in FIG. 18 and based on a temperature coefficient and a battery voltage. It is noted that in this characteristic view, the battery voltage is divided into three, i.e. high, medium and low magnitudes.

Furuya et al. teaches determining the coil temperature, not compensation variables. Furthermore, Furuya et al. does not teach any interpolation, but instead uses three generalized curves which do not provide for temperatures or supply voltages lying between table values.

The present invention recognizes the desirability of providing stored compensation variables based both on temperature and supply voltage and determining an appropriate compensation value based on the identified factors. The cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, fail to teach or suggest each limitation of the claimed invention.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 13 is condition for allowance. Claims 14-25 each depend from claim 13 and should each be allowed for at least the reasons set forth above.

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration and allowance of each of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes an interview, either personal or telephonic, will advance the prosecution of this matter, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner get in contact with the undersigned to arrange the same.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert P. Seitter, Reg. No. 24,856
Glenn M. Massina, Reg. No. 40,081
Attorneys for Applicants

RPS/GMM/

Dated: June 30, 2008

☒ P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

☐ P.O. Box 1596
Wilmington, DE 19899
(302) 778-2500

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.